

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed November 17, 2004, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 7, 1999, March 14, 2000, August 24, 2000, October 19, 2000, December 12, 2000, April 26, 2001, September 5, 2001, December 10, 2001, February 11, 2002, September 17, 2002, and May 3, 2004.

Claims 4, 9, 14, 25, 33, 36-38, 43, 51 and 54-66 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 4, 9, 14, 25, 33 and 54-62, have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and new claims 67 and 68 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicants are entitled. Accordingly, claims 4, 9, 14, 25, 33, 36-38, 43, 51 and 54-68 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 4, 9, 14, 25, 33, 63, 65, 67 and 68 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action rejects claims 4, 9, 14, 25, 33, 36-38, 43, 51, 54-66 as obvious based on the combination of JP 01-156725 to Matsueda and U.S. Patent No. 5,055,899 to Wakai et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the Official Action has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims. Independent claims 4, 9 and 14 have been amended to recite a blocking film interposed between a thin film transistor and a glass substrate. Matsueda and Wakai, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Independent claims 25 and 33 recite that a first hole and a second hole do not overlap to each other. This is shown in Figure 7(I), for example. For example, lead electrode 75 contacts a thin film transistor through a first hole and a pixel electrode through a second hole and these holes do not overlap. The Official Action asserts that "Matsueda shows two different contact holes not overlapping with each other (see at least Figures 2, 4)" (page 3, Paper No. 11082004). However, the pixel electrode 48 of Matsueda appears to be directly connected to the source/drain 42 while the rejected claims recite that a pixel electrode is electrically connected to a thin film transistor via a lead electrode. Wakai does not cure the above-referenced deficiencies in Matsueda. Wakai is relied upon to allegedly teach a contact metal film 119 (pages 2 and 4, Id.). However, Wakai also does not teach or suggest that a first hole and a second hole do not overlap, as particularly recited in claims 25 and 33. Therefore, Matsueda and Wakai, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least that a first hole and a second hole do not overlap.

Independent claims 63 and 65 recite that a first signal line is electrically connected to gate electrodes of first and second thin film transistors while a second signal line is electrically connected to one of a source and drain of the first thin film transistor and one of a source and drain of the second thin film transistor. That is, one pixel has at least first and second thin film transistors. These features are not taught or suggested by Matsueda, either alone or in combination with Wakai.


Since Matsueda and Wakai do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

New independent claims 67 and 68 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicants are entitled. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 67 and 68 are in condition for allowance.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action refers to "the obviousness double patenting rejection" (page 3, Paper No. 11082004). In a telephone interview with Examiner Ton held December 17, 2004, it was confirmed that this was an inadvertent error, and that no double patenting rejections are pending in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789